DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 138 421 RC 009 877

AUTHOR Compton, John H.
TITLE Social Work Education for American Indians.
INSTITUTION Denver Univ., Colo. Research Inst.
SPONS AGENCY Children's Bureau (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Sep 76
GRANT HEW-100-75-0177
NOTE 68p.; Related documents include RC 009 895, RC 009 876-879
AVAILABLE FROM Center for Social Research & Development, Spruce Hall, Room 21, University of Denver, Denver, Colorado 80208 (#60, $4.00)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *American Indians; Ancillary Services; College Graduates; Course Content; *Educational Improvement; Faculty; Graduate Study; Higher Education; Needs Assessment; *Participant Satisfaction; *Professional Education; Program Content; *Relevance (Education); School Surveys; *Social Workers; Student Recruitment

ABSTRACT

The survey obtained information on the recruitment of American Indians into social work, assessed the nature of their formal social work education, and considered the relevance and efficacy of their training for work with Indian people, especially in child welfare matters. Information was also gathered on the formal and informal programming for the recruitment and retention of Indian students and faculty, and the numbers of recent Indian graduates with MSW degrees and their employment histories. Questionnaires were mailed to Indian students, graduates, faculty, and 84 accredited schools of social work. Responses were received from 19 students, 26 graduates, 10 faculty, and 54 schools. Respondents were asked: their opinions on curricular content and on how social work educational programs might be improved to better serve Indian students and social work practitioners with Indian clientele. Conclusions drawn from the survey were that: formal graduate educational programs in social work for Indians in off-reservation colleges appeared to be the most effective way of serving Indian students and their communities; much more work needed to be done by schools of social work, including those schools with formalized programs for Indians, to improve all aspects of their programs so that they can better serve Indian people; and there was a need for greater participation by Indian people in many aspects of these programs. (NQ)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

rec 03-06-77 4.00
#60

ED138421

SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION FOR AMERICAN INDIANS

By

John H. Compton

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Center for Social Research and Development
Denver Research Institute/University of Denver
2142 South High Street
Denver, Colorado 80208

September 1976

RC009872

This project has been funded with federal funds from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under contract number HEW-100-75-0177. The content of this publication does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.

Center for Social Research and Development

The Center for Social Research and Development (CSRD), Denver Research Institute (DRI), University of Denver conducts applied social research focusing on social problems and policy issues relevant to local, regional, national, and international concerns. In addition, CSRD provides technical assistance and consultation through its research utilization program to governmental agencies and to nonprofit community service and educational organizations.

As an interdisciplinary facility for applied social research, CSRD engages the efforts of its own core staff of social scientists, as well as of social science departments, professional schools, and various colleges at the University of Denver. The Center's approach makes available specialized skills and provides a means of coordinating those skills so that they have maximum impact on the question under investigation. CSRD provides a mechanism to coordinate logically related, yet independent projects, to encourage cross-fertilization among projects, to insure continuity in relationships with governmental and nongovernmental agencies, and to increase the utilization of existing research findings. Thus, CSRD is a facility for synthesizing and applying current social science knowledge and for generating new knowledge by pursuing research dealing with identification and solution of critical social problems.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

Purpose of the Study 1
Methodology of the Survey 1

HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF THE FIELD OF SOCIAL WORK AS IT RELATES TO AMERICAN INDIANS 5

Early Contacts Between Social Workers and Indians 5
Recent Indian Experiences with Social Work and Social Workers 7

FINDINGS OF THE SURVEY 9

Schools of Social Work 9
Indian Students at Schools of Social Work 15
Indian Graduates of Schools of Social Work 25
Indian Graduate Faculty at Schools of Social Work 36

ISSUES IN SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION 45

General Suggestions for Improving Social Work Education for Indians 45
The Issue of Curricular Relevance 48
Suggested Curricular Modifications 49
Social Work Education in Nongraduate Institutions 53

IMPLICATIONS AND POLICY ALTERNATIVES 55

Implications of the Survey Findings 55
Policy Alternatives 56

NOTES 59

PREFACE

This survey of social work education as it pertains to American Indians was part of a larger study of existing child welfare services to Indians on and off reservations.* Because Indian child welfare was the major focus of the study, this monograph makes a special effort to relate Indian child welfare to social work education for American Indians.

The decision to include a survey of social work education in the study of existing child welfare services to Indians was made with the recognition that the formal educational preparation which child welfare service providers receive affects the quality of the services rendered. Frequently studies of social welfare services to Indians neglect this important component of the delivery of services. Yet one of the most frequent complaints of Indian people has been the insensitivity and lack of understanding and respect exhibited by personnel providing services. This type of complaint has been especially sharp and frequent when applied to the provision of child welfare services to Indians.

This survey was confined to Masters of Social Work (MSW) graduate social work educational programs, even though other levels of social work education are also pertinent to child welfare services to Indians and should be examined in further research.

Descriptive data on the nature of MSW graduate programs were sought from the eighty-four accredited schools of social work in the United States. The primary purpose of this part of the survey was to obtain information on the kinds of attention which are being given to Indian students and their communities. Data concerning the relevance of these graduate programs to Indian people were sought from three other respondent groups: Indian MSW students, Indian MSW social workers, and Indian faculty teaching in graduate social work programs.

John H. Compton

---

*See Center for Social Research and Development, Indian Child Welfare: A State-of-the-Field Study (Denver: University of Denver, July 1976) for the complete report of the study's findings.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many people were instrumental in the completion of this survey of social work education as it pertains to American Indians. I especially wish to thank the respondents who participated in the survey, particularly the Indian students, social workers, and faculty. Many Indian people justifiably prefer not to participate in research because of their past negative experiences with researchers and research on Indians.

Special appreciation is also offered to the Center for Social Research and Development (CSRD) support staff for their invaluable help ir the preparation of this report: to Cindy Mohr for her editorial work; to Joyce Compton for supervising the production of the report; to Kaye Sanders for assisting in compiling the data; and to Jan Beuthel for typing the report.

The following members of the CSRD staff also provided invaluable suggestions and assistance during all phases of the survey: Edward Baumheier, DeWitt John, Tillie Walker, Janet Derr, Joan Bell, Ellen Slaughter, Gale Whiteneck, and Ann Kraetzer.

A panel of Indian consultants which met at the Warm Springs Indian Reservation in Oregon also provided suggestions and comments pertaining to social work education for American Indians, and these comments proved useful in writing the final report.

Finally, I want to thank my children--Colleen, Annette, and Stuart--for their assistance in preparing the questionnaires for mailing and in tabulating the survey data.

John H. Compton

INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

It can be and often has been argued that social welfare services for American Indians, including child welfare services, are less than adequate because most of the staff who provide these services are non-Indians who are often unfamiliar with or insensitive to the cultures of the people they serve.[1] This problem is exacerbated by the fact that social workers are greatly influenced by the formal education and training they receive. In spite of the recent relaxation of guidelines by the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE), which formerly required considerable standardization of social work curricula, all eighty-four accredited schools of social work in the United States tend to have similar philosophies, curricula, and faculty.[2] The result is that both non-Indian and Indian graduates of these programs receive a fairly uniform education, and this uniformity forms the basis for their practice of social work. Many of these same graduates later become involved either in providing direct services to Indians or in influencing the policies, planning, and administration of social work programs. In this way the graduates have a considerable impact on the nature and quality of child welfare services, as well as the availability of these services.

METHODOLOGY OF THE SURVEY

Respondent Groups

The survey focused on three respondent groups and eighty-four accredited schools of social work in the U.S. The eighty-four schools were identified through the CSWE's official directory of schools and were questioned by mail about their graduate educational programs, whether they recruited Indian students and faculty, and about the nature of their curricula and support services.

The purposes of CSRD's survey of schools of social work were to obtain information on the recruitment of Indians into the field of social work, to assess the nature of their formal social work education, and to consider the relevance and efficacy of their training for work with Indian people, especially in child welfare matters. Information on formal and informal programming for the recruitment and retention of Indian students and faculty was of special interest since this information has a direct impact on the future manpower needs of child welfare services. In relation to the immediate manpower picture we sought information on the numbers of recent Indian graduates with MSW degrees, their employment histories, and their judgments about the degree to which they found their formal social work education relevant and applicable to serving Indian clientele.

We also sought the opinions and views of three respondent groups--Indian students, graduates, and graduate faculty--on various aspects of the schools of social work with which they had been or were affiliated. More specifically, respondents were asked to give their opinions on curricular content, including materials on Indians, and on the relevance of that content to social work services for Indians. In addition, we sought to determine whether or not curricular content or practicum included attention to child welfare. Also of interest were the specific support services provided to Indian students. Finally, respondents were asked to suggest how social work educational programs might be improved to better serve Indian students and social work practitioners with Indian clientele.

The decision to survey all graduate schools of social work was made with the recognition that many schools located in areas of the country with small Indian populations would probably not actively recruit Indians. However, it could not be ruled out that some Indians would choose to attend such schools since all schools are influenced by and made conscious both of the affirmative action stipulations of the federal monies they receive and the accreditation requirement of the Council on Social Work Education, which stipulates that every school is required to recruit for cross-cultural diversity. Although many of the schools with MSW degree programs are also involved in undergraduate social work and social welfare education, a decision was made to confine the survey to graduate programs since graduate social work degrees are traditionally considered most desirable for effective social work practice. Persons holding MSWs also have the greatest influence in social service agencies.

In addition, Indian graduate students, faculty, and recent MSW graduates were identified using the membership list of the Association of American Indian Social Workers and the eighty-four schools of social work. The latter were asked to submit lists of their recent Indian graduates, current students, and faculty. Information from other organizations and individuals that serve Indians, such as the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) and Indian social workers with knowledge of other Indian people fitting into these respondent categories, was also utilized.

Initially the social work practitioner respondent group was confined to those Indians who obtained their MSWs after 1960. It was believed that those few Indian people who obtained their degrees before this period would have responded in terms of more distant experiences, and we were not interested in comparing past and current experiences. However, the few respondents who graduated before 1960 were later included.*

It was assumed that deep involvement in the social work educational system would produce definite perceptions and views of current MSW programs among the student respondent group. It was further assumed that almost all of these students had plans to work with Indian clientele when they completed their studies. This assumption was based on feedback received from Indian individuals, as well as on information obtained from the Association of American Indian Social Workers.

The Indian faculty respondent group is also intimately involved in formally preparing people to work with Indian clientele. Although the number of Indian faculty was known to be very small, most members of this group obtained their positions with the specific intent of positively changing programs to serve Indian clientele more effectively. Most schools which hired Indian faculty probably shared this intent.

Questionnaire Return Rate

Because schools of social work and Indian students, graduates, and faculty, were widely scattered, project staff decided that mail questionnaires were the most economical method

---

*Inclusion was made after an initial low response rate to the survey, described in the next section.

of gathering information. Questionnaires were designed to allow comparisons of the judgments and opinions of the three Indian respondent groups on some issues. One drawback and difficulty of using mail questionnaires which was duly noted was the fact that Indian people generally have a negative attitude toward research because of the continually increasing number of studies being done on them. In order to get a good return rate, the three respondent groups and the schools of social work were reminded by mail to complete their questionnaires, and these reminders were followed up by phone calls when necessary. For example, Indian faculty at two schools in vicinities which had large numbers of Indian students and graduates were asked to remind these people to complete their questionnaires.

Nevertheless, the questionnaire return rate was still fairly low and can be attributed, at least in part, to the justifiable dislike for and suspicion of research by Indian people in general as well as by Indian professionals. Criticisms of the purpose and design of much of the research on Indian people have centered on the fact that much of the information obtained has not only been misleading but that it has also been misused over the years. In addition, much of the increased funding made available for research on Indians--principally federal funding--has gone to groups which many Indian people feel have neither the sensitivity nor the basic knowledge about Indians to produce useful or valid information. Also many non-Indian organizations receiving research grants have made only feeble attempts or no attempts at all to involve Indian people in the actual conduct of research because many non-Indians believe that most Indians are not qualified to engage in research. Hopefully, as more and more research on Indians is Indian controlled and influenced, and more non-Indians realize that there are competent Indian researchers, Indian suspicion and dislike for research will be reduced substantially and the benefits of this research to Indian people will increase.

HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF THE FIELD OF SOCIAL WORK AS IT RELATES TO AMERICAN INDIANS

In order to better understand the relevance of social work education to American Indians it is important that we be aware of how historical events influenced the current status of social work education and how social work education in turn relates to child welfare services to Indian people.

EARLY CONTACTS BETWEEN SOCIAL WORKERS AND INDIANS

It is unclear when social workers were first assigned to Indian tribes and communities. As early as the 1911 annual conference of the Society of American Indians, Arthur C. Parker suggested that the organization sponsor the establishment of "social betterment stations" on reservations.[3] (This idea may have come from the settlement house movement in urban areas of the United States at that time.) Parker, a member of the Seneca Tribe as well as an author and anthropologist, proposed that these social betterment stations "teach the necessary things of hygiene and industry" to Indians as well as help them to engage in what is now considered social action.[4] His idea was not readily supported by his fellow society members, but it did gradually gather support, until at the 1915 annual conference of the society a proposal to establish "a community center movement" was approved.[5]

The general goal of these centers was to help reservation Indians to "become a strong factor in bringing reservation Indians into a better understanding and harmonious relationship with the civilization of the country." Obviously the goal of these centers was to encourage Indians to assimilate into the general society. The first and only center was opened at Fort Duchesne, Utah, on the Ute Reservation, now known as the Uintah and Ouray Reservation. Gertrude L. Bonnin, a Sioux whose husband was employed by the Indian Service on the reservation, was placed in charge of the center. She later reported that the "main activities consisted of sewing classes for women, the serving of inexpensive lunches on 'Ration Day' when the Indians gathered to collect their rations, and the provision of a 'Rest-room' for the Indians." The center was closed a few years later when Mrs. Bonnin's husband was transferred to another Indian station.[6]

As early as 1929, proposals were made at an annual conference of the National Conference of Social Work that social workers should become involved in the social welfare needs of reservation Indians. Prior to this time, personnel from Christian churches, such as the Society of Friends (Quakers), offered services which were similar to those provided by social workers. These people were called "field matrons" and in effect acted as visiting nurses, home demonstration agents, and missionaries. This program lasted from 1890 to about 1924, when the field matrons were replaced by public health nurses who not only provided health services but also performed many social services functions. In 1931 the first social worker sent to an Indian community by the Bureau of Indian Affairs was assigned to provide basic services to Indians, such as emergency funds, clothing, and shelter and was also to participate in placing Indian children in BIA and church boarding schools.[7] In the 1950s, when the United States Public Health Service was given responsibility for the provision of health services to Indians on reservations, social workers were also assigned to the staff.

Other important agents of the federal government performed many of the functions social workers now perform. For example, BIA "Agency Farmers," who were stationed in small communities on many reservations, were supposed to teach and coerce Indians to become farmers. In addition to their main function, they quite often made crude attempts at personal counseling, made referrals to other sources, or occasionally acted as advocates for Indian people.[8] Others offering informal social services included agency superintendents, teachers, and, not surprisingly, Christian ministers and priests.

Like many of the other professionals who invaded Indian communities, social workers introduced technologies* that were developed in a non-Indian context and were perceived by Indian recipients of services as performing more of a social control than a helping function.[9] Social work was not only developed in a different cultural context, but the social workers assigned to Indian communities were generally expected to support the major policy of assimilation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.[10] This assimilationist policy continued until the early 1960s, when it was changed

---

*As used here, the term "technologies" encompasses specialized knowledge, techniques, methodologies, and their underlying value structures.

by the Kennedy administration,[11] but Indians continued to distrust social workers as agents of undesired change, viewing them as they had other professionals and agents of the federal government.

RECENT INDIAN EXPERIENCES WITH SOCIAL WORK AND SOCIAL WORKERS

While this suspicion gradually diminished, most Indians continue to distrust social workers, and this legacy must now be faced as social work is modified to serve American Indians more effectively.[12] Currently there is a strong belief among Indians that social workers have not adapted their technology to any appreciable degree so that it may better apply to Indian people.[13] In fact, social work education has not taken significant steps toward this objective in spite of some recent initial attempts toward it.[14]

However, there have been a number of attempts to reform social work education so that it can better serve Indians and other minorities since 1970. In that year, as a result of minority group protests and pressures, the Council on Social Work Education (the accrediting agency for all schools of social work in the United States) formally committed itself to pay special attention to the needs of minority groups and to work to eradicate racism in social work education.[15] A year later the Delegate Assembly of the National Association of Social Workers (NASW) adopted a policy statement, "Civil Liberties, Justice, and the Right to Dissent."[16] Thus, these two major social work professional organizations set the stage for the implementation of programmatic changes in social work organizations and schools of social work, and hence for changes in social workers' attitudes and behavior toward other races and minorities, including Indians. Concurrent with the formal policy changes adopted by these two organizations, the Association of American Indian Social Workers was formed by a small core of Indian social workers concerned with the social welfare problems of Indians and the seeming inability of the social work establishment to offer meaningful services to Indian people and effective solutions to their problems. This Indian organization was able to form liaisons and provide consultative guidance to the non-Indian professional organizations regarding Indian issues, Indian problems, and potential solutions to these problems. Subsequently, it had input into the provision of social welfare services to Indian people and suggested modifications

in the educational programs of Indian and non-Indian social workers who might eventually serve Indian clients.

Indians were also named to the the CSWE's Special Committee on Minority Groups, now the Commission on Minority Groups. Out of this commission came the American Indian Task Force, all of whose members were Indian and which was charged with studying the social welfare problems and needs of Indians as well as making recommendations for changes in social work education. In its 1973 report the task force recommended that schools of social work give highest priority to the recruitment of Indian students and faculty, to the securing of funds for stipends and scholarships, and to the development of content relevant to Indians for inclusion in social work curricula.[17] The main objectives of these recommendations were to improve social work education for both Indian and non-Indian social workers who might serve Indian people and to give social workers greater access to knowledge about Indians and a greater sensitivity to their cultural differences and socioeconomic conditions. These efforts are just now beginning to bear fruit, mainly by increasing the number of Indian students attending schools of social work. There is still much progress to be made in the recruitment of Indian faculty and in curricular modifications, and the gains which have been made in these areas are themselves in jeopardy because of cutbacks in federal funding.

FINDINGS OF THE SURVEY

SCHOOLS OF SOCIAL WORK

The Council on Social Work Education conducts an annual statistical survey of all schools of social work which, in addition to reporting other data, categorizes students and faculty members by ethnicity. "American Indian" constitutes one category in this breakdown. The last survey available shows the following numbers of American Indian faculty and students at eighty-four schools of social work as of 1 November 1974:[18]

American Indian Faculty		American Indian Students	
Graduate	20	Undergraduate	213
Undergraduate	6	Graduate--1st year	(49)
		Graduate--2nd year	(40)
TOTAL	26	New schools (awaiting accreditation)	(4)
		Total Graduate (less than doctoral level)	93
		Doctoral	5
		GRAND TOTAL	311

These data show that there is a reasonably large pool of undergraduate students who could be recruited by graduate schools or by social welfare programs with positions that require a bachelor's degree.

Fifty-four of eighty-four accredited schools of social work (64.3 percent) responded to CSRD's survey of the graduate component of social work education.* For purposes of analysis,

---

*Since all of the schools which reported Indian students and faculty in a 1974 CSWE survey responded to our questionnaire, it can be assumed that few Indian students or faculty members were missed by the CSRD survey. See Lillian Ripple, ed., Statistics on Social Work Education in the United States: 1974 (New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1975), pp. 6, 12, 20-23, 48-50.

the schools which responded were divided into two categories. In the first category we placed schools which reported having no Indian faculty, graduates, or students. In the second we placed those schools which reported having Indian faculty, graduates, or students. The second category included a subgroup of nine schools which reported having formal recruitment and educational programs for Indians at the graduate level, and this subgroup is analyzed separately.

Schools Reporting No Indian Faculty, Graduates, or Students

Thirty-three schools, located in the East, Midwest, South. and in California, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico reported having no Indian students, graduates, or faculty. While several cities located in these areas (Chicago, New York, Los Angeles, and San Francisco) do have over ten thousand Indian residents, generally the Indian population in these areas is quite low, with other large minority groups tending to overshadow the much smaller Indian communities.

Curricular Content Relevant to Indians. Only two of the responding schools in this category reported that they included major units specifically on Indians in their courses on racism or minority groups. Other schools indicated that their courses included some information on Indians along with information on other minority groups. Two schools reported that their colleges had Indian studies departments, but neither required students to take courses in these departments. Only a few schools mentioned providing some attention to Indian people as part of the focus on minority groups in field placement learning experiences. None of the schools reported special field experience placements aimed at offering Indian or non-Indian students practical experience with Indian clientele. The three schools which reported that they had curricular content which related directly to Indian child welfare noted that this material was incorporated into curricula on human growth and development and did not focus on child welfare services per se.

Based on the sketchy responses of these schools, all seem to offer basic, traditional curriculum sequences in human behavior in the social environment, social welfare policy, social work methods, and field work (practicum). These schools offer little or no curricular content on Indians per se, and where content does relate to Indians, it is generally included with content on other minority groups and/or discussed in courses on racism. It should be kept in mind that the Council on Social Work Education's mandatory Accreditation Standard 1234a is aimed at increasing the

recruitment of minority and women students and faculty and expects all schools of social work to incorporate curricular content on minorities, women, and racism.

Support Services. Ten of these thirty-three schools reported that they had made some efforts to recruit Indian students, and five of the ten reported that these efforts were part of general programs to recruit students from all minority groups. Five of the thirty-three reported that they had made unsuccessful efforts to recruit Indian faculty. Six schools reported that they had made efforts to recruit Indians through informal contacts with agencies, Indian organizations, or individual Indians. Two schools in Texas reported they were members of the Texas Consortium of Graduate Schools, which has a formal minority recruitment program which includes Indians. The necessity of conforming to affirmative action requirements and an interest in Indian students were reasons given for attempting to recruit Indians. Although this minority recruitment program (consisting of four schools) has been in existence since 1968, only eleven Indian students were recruited through it, and in examining the program's statistical information, it appears that there have been only two Indian graduates.[19]

All thirty-three of the schools reported having some or all of the following support services: tutorial services; remedial courses; educational counseling; personal counseling; housing location; temporary loans; job placement; and child care. No school listed any other unique service. Only one school reported that its services could provide special attention to Indian students if any were present, and four schools indicated that they believed that their services could adequately meet the needs of Indian students.

Schools Reporting Indian Faculty, Graduates, or Students

Twenty-one schools reported having a total of fifteen full-time and one part-time Indian graduate faculty members, ninety-two graduate students, and seventy-four recent graduates. Nine of these twenty-one schools reported that they had formal recruitment and educational programs for Indians. These schools have been subdivided into two groups: (1) schools which reported having specific formal programs for Indians; and (2) schools which reported no formal programs for Indians. The nine schools which reported having special

recruitment and educational programs for Indians are listed below with the dates when their programs began:*

University of Washington, 1970
University of Minnesota-Duluth, 1971
University of Oklahoma, 1971
University of Utah, 1971
Arizona State University, 1972
Barry College (Florida), 1972
Portland State University (Oregon), 1972
University of Denver, 1972
California State University-Sacramento, 1976

Over three-fourths of the total number of Indian students and faculty reported by all twenty-one schools of social work were at these nine schools (seventy-four students and twelve and one-half faculty members). At these schools the number of Indian students ranged from two to nineteen, and the number of Indian faculty ranged from one to three (one school reported three faculty members). Two schools reported two faculty members, and the rest had one Indian faculty member each. Finally, the nine claimed fifty-two of the fifty-three recent Indian graduates listed.**

---

*Although the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee was thought to have a formal social work recruitment and educational program for Indians, the school itself indicated that it did not have such a program when it responded to the questionnaire.

**This last statistic may be misleading since many schools have not kept track of the ethnicity of their students until quite recently. Thus, it is possible that these nine schools have merely made special efforts to identify Indians who received MSWs prior to the establishment of their programs. It should also be noted here that it is currently beneficial for schools of social work to show large numbers of minority graduates, students, and faculty. By doing so, they not only fulfill the CSWE's Accreditation Standard 1234a, but they also increase their chances of obtaining and continuing federal funding. Therefore, many Indian social workers, students, and faculty members are critical of the motivations of schools of social work. They frequently observe that schools would not recruit Indians if they had to use university or college funds to do so but that they are quite willing when federal funds are available.

Curricular Relevance. All of these nine schools are at more advanced stages than other schools of social work in terms of developing and incorporating materials on the American Indian into their curricula. Eight schools reported content related to American Indians in two or more curriculum sequence areas. For example, the University of Minnesota-Duluth (UM-D), which has committed itself to producing graduates in community development and related specializations, reported no content on American Indians in the traditional curriculum sequence areas, except in the social welfare policy and planning sequence. Instead, planned content on Indians in UM-D's curriculum centers on social development and community organization, primarily on Indian reservations. Still, it is not clear how much of this planned content is actually being taught.

None of the twenty-one schools (including the nine schools with formal Indian programs) reported a major curricular focus on child welfare services to Indian people. Child welfare content was incorporated into related curricular areas, such as services to children and families. None reported having field placements with a special focus on child welfare services to Indian people. One school which reported having four separate courses on the American Indian and offering specialized field placements in organizations that serve Indian clientele had no courses which focused exclusively on child welfare.

Seven of the nine schools with Indian programs reported having special practicum placements in agencies serving Indians, including the BIA, Indian Health Service (IHS), tribal social service agencies, urban Indian centers, and Indian boarding schools. There were a few scattered miscellaneous placements, such as in an Indian inmate organization in a penitentiary in Oregon and in a correctional school for boys. Portland State and the University of Utah reported block placements* in BIA social service agencies in Alaska. California State at Sacramento reported a very interesting placement program which is now in the planning stages. This program, which will be urban based and which will deal with alcoholism, will hire a "Native American Community Professor" who will be patterned after the "Barrio Professors" at some schools of social work which serve Chicano people. The "Barrio Professor" is not required to have traditional academic qualifications but is qualified

---

*Block placements are discussed and described more fully on p. 47.

instead by his living experiences in the Chicano community. It is hoped that the "Community Professor" will be able to offer the kinds of information, views, and feelings that the academician cannot offer. It is apparent from the above examples that the schools with formal Indian programs have made progress in giving Indian and non-Indian students interested in obtaining field placement experience excellent opportunities to fulfill their objectives.

Support Services. Seven of the schools with formal Indian recruitment programs reported having all or most student support services on which we sought information.* These schools also indicated that special attention was being given to Indian students and that their services were adequately meeting Indian students' needs. Most of the twenty-one schools reported having some or all of the support services listed in the questionnaire and most reported that these services were available to all students, including Indians. Approximately two-thirds believed that these services were adequately meeting the needs of American Indian students.

However, there were a few exceptions. One school (Utah) indicated that there was no need for the university to offer job placement services for Indian graduates since they received many job offers without solicitation. A second school with a formal program for Indians reported having no support services, and a third reported having only personal and educational counseling services.

All twenty-one schools reported that financial assistance, such as stipends, scholarships, and loans, were available to meet the needs of all American Indian students. The nine schools with special programs for Indians reported earmarking funds specifically for American Indians, while the other schools with Indian students had money available for minorities in general.

Funding sources are almost exclusively federal, with the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) being the two funding sources most frequently cited by respondents. One school (Utah) listed the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (Mormon) as one of its sources of funding. Although most schools reported

---

*These services included tutorial services; remedial courses; educational counseling; recruitment; personal counseling; housing location assistance; short-term loans; day care; and job placement.

that tuition waivers and other forms of financial assistance were available directly from their colleges or universities, they were not major sources of financial support for Indian students.

One reason for the high dropout rate of Indian students at all educational levels is the lack of appropriate supportive services. At the graduate level the Indian student usually does not have access to the social and emotional support of his community; he may suffer from educational deficiencies; and he most frequently lacks sufficient funds to purchase everything he needs to maintain himself while in school. However, it is a mistake to design support services exclusively to serve Indians. While many Indian students have had access to poor educational programs and thus are deficient in some areas, it is a myth that all Indian students are educationally deficient. Quite often a conscientious and sensitive faculty advisor or teacher can help Indian students routinely without reference to their ethnicity, thus avoiding paternalism. It is also a myth that Indian students are provided with higher levels of financial assistance than other students. As a matter of fact, the competition for financial assistance is much greater for Indian students at the graduate than at the undergraduate level.

INDIAN STUDENTS AT SCHOOLS OF SOCIAL WORK

Although there were ninety-two Indian MSW students enrolled in the schools of social work which responded to the survey,* only sixty-eight of these students were identified specifically by name and current address. In spite of mail and phone followups, only nineteen students (or fewer than one-third of the students surveyed) returned questionnaires, making this respondent group the most difficult of the three to reach.

A Profile of Indian Students at Schools of Social Work

The nineteen students represented twelve tribes. Six students were Navajos, two students were Cherokees, two

---

*Although CSWE identified ninety-three Indian MSWs in its 1974 survey, CSRD was only able to identify ninety-two Indian MSW students.

were from the Santo Domingo Pueblo, and nine tribes were represented by one student each. With two exceptions all of the tribes were located in the western part of the United States. Respondents ranged in age from twenty-three to fifty-two, with almost half being over thirty. Survey data suggest that Indian MSW students are generally older than non-Indian MSW students.* The male to female ratio was similar for Indian and non-Indian students. Approximately two-thirds of the respondents were female and one-third were male.[20] About half of the Indian students were married, with an average of 1 1/2 children per married student. The largest family had 8 children, while three students had 1 child and two had no children.

The students attended six schools of social work including the universities of Utah (six students), Oklahoma (three students), Denver (three students), Arizona State University (three students), Portland State University (three students), and the University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee (one student). Half of the respondents were first-year graduate students and half were second-year graduate students. The final student was attending school part time. Seven of the eighteen students who attended schools which claimed to have special programs for Indians indicated that no special programs for Indians existed at their schools. Either they did not understand the questionnaire, or they were not aware that their schools had formal programs for Indians.

Almost all students received full or partial financial assistance from the federal government, usually from the National Institute of Mental Health or the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Four students received assistance from their tribes, while two students depended largely on their own personal resources. Survey data lend support to the contention that since federal funds continue to be the major source of financial help for all Indian college students, it is essential that they not be reduced or eliminated. It is highly unlikely that any federal cutbacks would be made up from other sources since the competition for nonfederal funds is increasing and private financial support is being reduced.

---

*Approximately three-fourths of the MSW students included in the 1974 CSWE survey were thirty years of age or less, while only slightly more than one-half of the Indian students participating in our survey were in that age range (see Lillian Ripple, ed., Statistics on Social Work Education in the United States: 1974 (New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1975), p. 26.

Only a few of the students were required by their social work educational programs to engage in research projects or theses. These few chose topics which pertained to Indians, except for one student who was not allowed to choose his subject and was assigned to do a research project on blacks.

Almost all students listed "treatment" as their specialty area. Only one student listed his specialty as community organization and planning, two listed administration, and one listed no specialty. This pattern is similar to that of the general population of graduate social work students, who also tend to specialize in either treatment or direct services.

Most people seeking degrees in social work, including Indians, believe that treatment and/or direct-service skills are the only options in social work. Few people realize that there are other specializations, such as community organization, planning, administration, and research. However, MSW graduates are pressured or enticed by higher salaries to accept non-direct service jobs, especially in administration. Because of the relatively small number of Indian people with MSW degrees, the pressure on those with the most training to take nondirect service jobs is even greater, and they are removed from direct service jobs in social welfare programs which serve Indians. This raises the question of whether MSWs are really necessary for effective service provision to Indian people.

Students' Perceptions of Social Work Education

Perceptions of Curricular Relevance. Students were almost evenly divided about whether social welfare policy and planning, human behavior, and social work methods curricula were pertinent to their educational needs. Five students responded that the child welfare curricular area met their learning needs, and nine responded that it did not. Three students indicated that their schools did not have curricular content in the child welfare area (see table 1). However, few students took the opportunity to comment on curricula. One student objected to the fact that his school's curricular content on Indians tended to focus on reservation Indians and treated urban Indians as just another subgroup of the disadvantaged poor. Another student commented that his school's curricular content on Indians was very general, except in one course.

Other criticisms were similar to those voiced by minority students in general since the 1960s. Basically it has been argued that curricular content is not relevant to various

TABLE 1

STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE ADEQUACY OF GRADUATE CURRICULA
(T=19)

	Needs Met		Not Available	No Response
	Yes	No		
Social Welfare Policy and Planning	8	8	2	1
Human Behavior	8	8	2	1
Social Work Methods	9	7	2	1
Child Welfare	5	9	3	2
Other (responses not specified)		4		15

minority groups' socioeconomic and cultural realities and does not examine the systemic barriers that prevent minority groups from having or gaining access to the larger society's resources and opportunities. Indian students in particular have been critical of the failure of non-Indian faculty to illustrate or demonstrate how theories of human behavior, growth, and development and various helping techniques and methods of social work can be adapted to Indian cultures. They realistically ask why--if the theories, techniques, and methods included as part of the curricula are not applicable to Indian cultures--there is an absence of alternative content that is relevant to Indians.

There are a multitude of reasons given for this opposition to curricular change by non-Indian faculty and students. Most frequently opponents of change argue that students must adapt themselves to programs since it is impossible to adapt programs to the learning needs of all student groups. The fact that both established and newly arising interest groups are continuously competing for attention in schools of social work is used to support this argument. For example, women are vigorously seeking changes in social work programs, much as other minority groups have sought changes. Thus, there is a justifiable fear that if some changes are made (such as inclusion of curricular content on women), this will mean deleting curricular content relevant to minorities, including Indians. In addition, many people who are promoting the inclusion of content on racism are opposed to packaging it with content on sexism (and vice versa), even though the processes and structure of sexism and racism are somewhat similar.

Perceptions of Support Services. Most student respondents felt that their schools had met their needs in the areas of recruitment, financial support, educational and personal counseling, housing location, short-term loans, and job placement. However, most respondents felt that remedial courses, tutorial services, and child care were not adequately meeting Indian students' needs (see table 2). Students reported that short-term loans and child care were not offered at many schools. Loans have long been viewed as an acceptable and legitimate support service to help students with financial difficulties to remain in school, but some colleges and universities have only recently accepted the responsibility for providing child care services to students and their families. Due to the rising cost of child care services, many women students with children find it financially impossible to attend school without a low-cost source of child care. Normally this service would be provided by a relative in an Indian family, but since Indian students

TABLE 2

STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR SCHOOLS' SUPPORT SERVICES
(T=19)

	Needs Met		Not Available	No Response
	Yes	No		
Recruitment	10	8	1	
Financial Support	14	4	1	
Support Services:	10	8		1
Remedial courses	5	12	2	
Tutorial services	6	11	2	
Educational counseling	10	9		
Personal counseling	11	7	1	
Housing location	9	8	2	
Short-term loans	7	6	6	
Child care	4	9	6	
Other (responses not specified)	1	2	3	13
Job Placement	10	7	1	1

are not living in their home communities, this resource is not available and generally must be paid for. If the student respondent group is representative of most Indian social work students, then about half have children. Since their spouses may have to work in order to provide supplemental funds, there is a definite need for free or low-cost child care services.

Students' opinions on non-Indian support for the provision of special support services to Indians varied greatly. For example, twelve students believed that non-Indian faculty gave "some," "high," or "full" support to special recruitment efforts for Indians, and twelve believed that they supported special financial aid for Indians (see table 3). However, Indian students also seemed to believe that non-Indian students gave less support than non-Indian faculty to special support services for Indian students (see table 4). Indian students also believed that very few non-Indian students would strongly support the inclusion of curricular content on Indians (see table 5). Although these findings cannot be generalized to all Indian students in social work, enough students did perceive non-Indian faculty and students as not supporting such efforts to make the findings meaningful. Indian student, graduate, and faculty respondents informally verified that there was and continues to be opposition (both overt and covert) to programs designed to meet Indian expectations. Because of this opposition, Indian students and faculty must devote a certain amount of energy toward efforts to produce changes at the expense of educational tasks.

The student respondents generally felt that it was advantageous to have Indian faculty members at their schools. They stated that Indian faculty members were models for Indian students; provided personal and educational assistance for Indian students; were advocates for Indian students; helped to change schools in several respects (including their curricula); aided in recruiting Indian students; and could provide knowledge about and skills in dealing with Indians which could benefit both Indian and non-Indian students and faculty. However, some students stated that Indian faculty were merely tokens; that many were not really Indians or soon lost their "Indianness"; that they were overworked and that too much was expected of them since they were few in number; that they often did not take stands on issues; and that they really did not have enough influence to make an impact on schools. Some Indian students critized Indian faculty for becoming so indoctrinated by the "establishment" in schools of social work that they lost sensitivity to Indian people and failed to advocate Indian interests and views.

TABLE 3

INDIAN STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF NON-INDIAN
FACULTY SUPPORT FOR SUPPORT SERVICES
(T=19)

	Support or Lack of Support					
	None	Little	Some	High	Full	No Response
Recruitment	2	3	6	2	4	2
Financial Support	4	2	3	6	3	1
Support Services:						
Remedial courses	4	2	7	1	2	3
Tutorial services	5	2	6	3	2	1
Educational counseling		4	6	2	3	3
Personal counseling	2	7	4	2	3	1
Housing location	7	3	4	1	3	1
Short-term loans	4	6	4	2	2	1
Day care		11	4		1	3
Other (responses not specified)		2		1		16
Job Placement	4	3	6	2	2	2

TABLE 4

INDIAN STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF NON-INDIAN
STUDENT SUPPORT FOR SUPPORT SERVICES
(T=19)

	Support or Lack of Support					
	None	Little	Some	High	Full	No Response
Recruitment	5	5	6	2	1	
Financial Support	6	5	4	2	2	
Support Services:						
Remedial courses	8	1	7	2	1	
Tutorial services	8	2	6	1	2	
Educational counseling	8	2	5	2	2	
Personal counseling	7	4	5	1	2	
Housing location	7	6	4		2	
Short-term loans	8	5	4	1	1	
Day care	12	1	4		1	1
Other (responses not specified)	1					18
Job Placement	6	5	4		2	3

TABLE 5

INDIAN STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF NON-INDIAN
STUDENT SUPPORT OF CURRICULAR CONTENT RELEVANT TO INDIANS
(T=19)

	Support or Lack of Support					
	None	Little	Some	High	Full	No Response
Social Welfare Policy and Planning	5	4	7	2	1	
Human Behavior	5	5	6	1	2	
Social Work Methods	7	3	5	3	1	
Child Welfare Services	7	2	8	1	1	
Research	6	3	5	3	1	1
Other (responses not specified)		1				18
Field Work (special arrangements for Indian students)	6	3	5	2	2	1
Field Work (special arrangements for non-Indian students)	5	4	4	1	3	2

Informal information supplied by Indian faculty confirmed these perceptions. Indian faculty do often tend to feel swamped with multiple demands and expectations, and they also face demands on their time and energies from other social welfare-related organizations, both Indian and non-Indian. Thus, their contributions often are diluted because they are not able to spend ample time on some of their commitments, such as social work educational programs and their effects on Indian students and the Indian community.

INDIAN GRADUATES OF SCHOOLS OF SOCIAL WORK

Originally eighty-four Indian social workers with MSW degrees were identified, but current addresses were obtained for only sixty-seven of these graduates, and the questionnaire return rate was only 39 percent. The informal communications network between Indian social workers ("mocassin telegraph") proved to be useful in locating many graduates. However, informal feedback indicated that some graduates were too busy to respond and were overloaded with questionnaires of various kinds, most of which they considered to be of little benefit to Indian people. A few informally indicated that they would not respond at all, without providing a reason.

A Profile of Indian MSW Graduates. Like the Indian students, the MSW graduates were heterogenous in background. Respondents represented sixteen different tribes (the Cherokee Tribe was represented by six graduates). Respondents ranged in age from twenty-four to sixty-five, although most respondents were forty years old or less. There were almost equal numbers of men (fourteen) and women (twelve) in this group, and fifteen graduates were married, ten were single, and one was divorced. An overwhelming number of the respondents (twenty-one) had three children or less.

All twenty-six respondents listed the MSW as their highest degree, and twenty of these had obtained degrees between 1970 and 1975. This information would seem to confirm that since 1970 increased attention has been given to minorities, including Indians, and that this attention seems to have been worthwhile.

The twenty-six graduates obtained their degrees at seventeen different schools of social work, and seventeen graduates obtained degrees at seven of the nine schools which have formal programs for Indians. The University of Oklahoma and Arizona State University were each represented by five

graduates. Although these data are not conclusive, they do suggest that schools with formal Indian programs graduate more Indians and that the commitment of resources to these programs is therefore justified.

Twelve of the twenty-six graduates reported that they had specialized in community organization, planning, and/or administration, while fourteen reported that they had specialized in treatment. Two graduates reported that they had general specializations, one reported no specialization, and one was unsure of his specialization. Some graduates reported specializing in more than one area. This pattern would seem to indicate that Indian students are aware of Indian tribes' and organizations' needs for people with specializations in community organization, planning, and/or administration. It also reflects the fact that Indians with graduate degrees in social work fill positions of influence that focus on community systems as well as administrative positions and other jobs that do not involve direct service work.

Although the research requirement has been dropped by more and more schools of social work in recent years, nineteen respondents reported having engaged in some kind of research. Ten of these reported that their topics pertained directly to Indians, which may indicate that some schools are promoting research which is relevant to the learning needs and interests of Indian students and their communities. Research topics included: "Community Development Proposals for the Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma"; "Tribal Ideology and Implications for Social Policy"; "Social and Economic Conditions of the Creek Indians"; and "Cultural Identification and Educational Aspirations of Hopi Indian High School Students."

The twenty-six MSW graduates reported that they had received financial aid from several different sources. The BIA was cited thirteen times as a financial aid source; the National Institute of Mental Health was cited six times; states were cited five times; tribes were cited four times; and the Veterans Administration (VA) was cited three times. Eighteen respondents partially financed their educations. Twelve of these eighteen obtained loans from governmental or private organizations, five relied on personal savings, and one worked while attending school. Nineteen private organizations made financial contributions to the respondents. Almost every graduate listed more than one source of financial help. The reliance on a number of funding sources, the fact that these graduates could not rely solely on personal resources, and the similarity between the student and graduate funding profiles suggest that it is essential that governmental and private funding for Indian students pursuing graduate social work education be continued.

Past and Present Professional Backgrounds and Activities

Graduates reported that they were members of five Indian organizations, including the Association of American Indian Social Workers (eighteen members); the National Indian Education Association (three members); the National Congress of American Indians (three members); the Phoenix Indian Coalition (one member); and the Indian Mental Health Association (one member). The graduates reported that they also belonged to professional and community service organizations, including the National Association of Social Workers (ten members) and the Council on Social Work Education (three members). Several respondents reported membership in specialized professional and interest organizations, such as the Child Welfare League of America, the American Orthopsychiatric Association, the American Institute of Planners, and the National Council on Aging. Six respondents reported that they did not belong to any professional organization.

In the past some Indian social workers expressed disenchantment with many of these social work-related organizations, mainly because they justifiably perceived them as lacking interest in Indian concerns or as making well-intended but misguided attempts at addressing the interests of Indian people. Despite the 1971 declaration of a new policy to address minority needs, the National Association of Social Workers was still generally perceived as an organization that did not further Indian interests. However, there are a few Indian social workers currently involved in the Association and in other social work-related organizations, and a few are in positions of influence. For example, Indian social workers have been members of the CSWE's Commission on Minority Groups which has had some policy-making influence, especially in relation to accreditation standards for schools of social work.

Most of the respondents had only recently entered the social work profession, whether they were relatively young or relatively old. Eighteen of the respondents had worked for five years or less after receiving their MSW degrees, and of these eighteen, ten respondents had worked for three years or less. Six respondents had been in the profession for ten years or more, but one of these six had worked as few as twelve years, while another had worked for thirty-three years. Respondents who had five years of experience or less reported jobs that were administrative or supervisory just as often as those whose work experience exceeded ten years.

Graduate respondents had had a wide range of work experiences. All had worked or were currently working with Indian people. Twelve reported that their current employers served Indians exclusively, while twelve reported serving both Indians and non-Indians. Eighteen of the twenty-six graduates had worked as direct service providers, thirteen had been involved in administrative work, seven had worked in supervisory positions, eight had been involved in planning, five had been consultants, two had been involved in research, and five had been involved in some aspect of higher education or staff training. It is noteworthy that these graduates, most of whom had had their MSWs for five years or less, had moved rapidly into these nondirect service positions. Whether this finding can be generalized to the work experiences of all Indian graduates is not clear. However, both the data and the informal reports mentioned previously suggest that Indian social work graduates with MSW degrees move into jobs in administration, planning, and research, both because their numbers are small in relation to the number of positions available and because Indian candidates are often preferred for these positions. If some Indian social workers do engage in these jobs full or part time, then Indian social workers will be spread even thinner in many other areas. Hopefully a move by Indians into nondirect service jobs will be beneficial to Indian tribes and other Indian groups. There is a strong expectation by both Indians and non-Indians in social work education that all Indian people being educated for social work positions serve Indians in some way. It is also expected that most Indians will return to their home communities. These expectations do seem to be justified. Even though the graduate respondents to this survey cannot be viewed as representative of all Indian social workers, all are serving Indian people in some way and the membership list of the Association of American Indian Social Workers provides evidence that all of its members are serving Indian clientele in some capacity. Thus, the evidence suggests that most Indian social workers do pursue careers that serve their people and that the resources and support provided to this group were justified.

Graduates' Perceptions of Social Work Education

Perceptions of Curricular Relevance. Sixteen of the twenty-six respondents were critical of their schools' curricula. Over half of the graduates felt that the three traditional curricular areas of social welfare policy and planning, human behavior, and social work methods, as well as child welfare content generally, were not relevant to Indian people. Social welfare policy and planning was perceived as the most relevant of the four areas mentioned, while the child welfare area received the lowest rating (see table 6).

TABLE 6

GRADUATES' PERCEPTIONS OF THE RELEVANCE
OF THEIR SCHOOLS' GRADUATE CURRICULA
(T=26)

	Needs Met		Not Available	No Response
	Yes	No		
Social Welfare Policy and Planning	11	13	2	
Human Behavior	9	15	2	
Social Work Methods	9	15	2	
Child Welfare	7	16	3	
Other (responses not specified)		1		25

Most stated that the curricula paid only token attention to Indians, consisted largely of misinformation about Indians, and was oversimplified or too general to be useful. Even schools with formal programs for Indians were judged to be weak in this area. One respondent commented that the curriculum at his school was Freudian in orientation and had no relevance to Indians whatsoever. Another respondent was very frustrated because neither faculty nor students were available to help make judgments about what theoretical material was applicable to Indians and what was not. Another graduate complained about the complete absence of information on Indians, even though one faculty member in social welfare policy had been a long-time employee at a high administrative level in the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

The graduates were much more critical of curricular relevance than students, both in terms of the frequency of their negative responses and in their comments. There are two possible explanations for this difference. First, the graduates have had a chance to work in the field and thus have had a greater chance to apply their educational experiences. Secondly, many of these graduates have not been exposed to recent curricula that may give more attention to Indians. Still, however, the combined judgments of these two groups suggest strongly that the curricula of the schools of social work attended by both respondent groups are weak in Indian content and that their content has not been made relevant to Indian problems.

Graduates perceived non-Indian faculty support for inclusion of curricular content on American Indians much more positively than students (see table 7). Possibly students were more skeptical than graduates because they are in a school milieu where debate and attention is focused more specifically on the issue of modifying curricula. Perhaps current Indian students expect more from their educational experiences than the graduates expected, although many of the graduates were students when debate over curricular change began.

Like students, graduates believed that there were advantages and disadvantages to having Indian faculty members at schools of social work. The most frequently cited advantage in both groups was that Indian faculty members could serve as models for Indian students. The second most frequently cited advantage was that Indian faculty could support students and wield influence to change schools to serve Indian students and their communities more effectively. The third most frequently cited advantage was that they could promote changes in the attitudes and knowledge of non-Indian students and faculty in their schools. Other advantages were also listed,

TABLE 7

GRADUATES' PERCEPTIONS OF NON-INDIAN FACULTY SUPPORT FOR CURRICULAR CHANGE
(T=26)

Curriculum Area	Support or Lack of Support					
	None	Little	Some	High	Full	No Response
Social Welfare Policy and Planning	2	5	9	7	1	2
Human Behavior	3	4	10	4	1	2
Social Work Methods	5	5	7	6	1	2
Child Welfare Services	5	5	9	4	1	2
Research	4	3	8	7	1	3
Other		1	2	2		21
Field Work (special arrangements for Indian students)	5	3	5	10	3	
Field Work (special arrangements for non-Indian students interested in Indians)	4	4	6	7	3	2

such as publishing materials on Indians to be used for curricula, doing research on Indians, attracting money for Indian students and programs, helping to create an Indian community within a school, and counseling students.

Some graduates mentioned the disadvantages of having Indian faculty present: that schools had unrealistic workload expectations of Indian faculty; that Indian faculty were tokens; that Indian faculty "sold out" by being self-serving or not being culturally Indian; and that hiring Indian faculty took skilled people out of Indian communities. One person made a very interesting comment--that if an Indian faculty member were not qualified, it would make all Indian students look bad.

An open-ended question on how Indian social workers could have a continuing positive input into social work education for Indian people elicited the greatest number of comments. Sixty-six proposals, many of which pertained to some aspect of education or training, were made. Some of their suggestions included recruiting Indian students, developing field placements, developing and conducting training sessions, finding jobs for graduating Indian students, doing research, helping to develop curricula, and writing and/or publishing materials to be used in training and educating people who work with Indian clients. They also felt that they could increase membership and participation in social work- and Indian-related organizations, such as the Association of American Indian Social Workers, possibly found another national Indian social work-related organization, and increase participation in the Council on Social Work Education. Some graduates suggested ways in which Indian social workers could keep in touch with schools of social work and the Indian community. Finally, respondents mentioned the possibility of obtaining higher degrees in social work education, engaging in political action to promote social work education, and maintaining a high standard of professional social work performance.

Perceptions of Support Services. The graduate respondent group had definite perceptions of the support services of the schools of social work which they had attended (see table 8). Graduates who obtained their degrees before the era of increased attention to minorities generally did not comment on support services, or they made statements such as: "all students, including Indians, were on their own." Those students who graduated during or after the student and minority unrest of the late 1960s and early 1970s commented on support services in terms of their shortcomings or in terms of their absence. Two respondents felt that schools were not sincere in their provision of support

TABLE 8

GRADUATES' PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR SCHOOLS' SUPPORT SERVICES
(T=26)

	Needs Met		Not Available	No Response
	Yes	No		
Recruitment	6	12	8	
Financial Support	15	8	2	1
Support Services:				
Remedial courses	4	9	11	2
Tutorial services	5	9	11	1
Educational counseling	13	10	2	1
Personal counseling	11	11	3	1
Housing location	12	6	5	3
Short-term loans	11	4	8	3
Child care	5	8	11	2
Other (responses not specified)		3	3	20
Job Placement	7	9	6	4

services or that the people providing these services were of questionable sincerity, and one person commented that an Indian faculty person with a genuine interest in meeting the needs of students must be responsible for the overseeing or providing support services. None of the graduates mentioned being singled out for these services, and respondents noted that the schools which did provide services generally made them available to all students. While it is desirable to make services available to all students, Indian students must be made to feel genuinely welcome and must truly have access to services.

Eighteen respondents judged that recruitment of Indian students either did not exist at their schools or that it was inadequate. Only six respondents believed that their schools had made adequate recruitment efforts. Since recruitment is a key indicator of a school's commitment to minorities, including Indians, it is obviously a weak point, at least as far as graduates' perceptions are concerned.

The graduates perceived financial assistance for Indians as more adequate than recruitment. Fifteen people believed that Indian students' needs had been met, and eight believed that they had not. Only two graduates reported that financial assistance had not been available. Based on the past and current perceived experiences of both student and graduate respondents, improvement in the area of financial assistance is needed, at least at some schools.

Other support services received mixed ratings. Remedial courses and tutorial services were perceived as inadequate, while assistance in housing location and aid in finding short-term loans, two very practical and basic support services, were perceived as meeting the needs of Indian students most frequently. Remedial services, tutorial services, and child care were the three services which were most often perceived as not being available. The questionnaire did not ask whether a particular service was not available because it did not exist or because it was inaccessible.

Eleven graduates believed that there was little or no non-Indian faculty support for the recruitment of Indian students. Generally graduates were much more skeptical of non-Indian faculty support for recruitment than were Indian students. With regard to all other support services, including financial aid, student and graduate opinions were about the same. The graduates were also much more skeptical than students of non-Indian faculty support for job placement, with students feeling that non-Indian faculty provided more support. Possibly when the graduates attended school, recruitment, financial aid, and other more specific support services for Indian students were not deemed appropriate (see table 9).

TABLE 9

GRADUATES' PERCEPTIONS OF NON-INDIAN
FACULTY SUPPORT FOR SUPPORT SERVICES
(T=26)

	Support or Lack of Support					
	None	Little	Some	High	Full	No Response
Recuitment	4	7	8	4	1	2
Financial Support	3	4	6	8	2	3
Support Services:						
Remedial courses	8	7	4	3		3
Tutorial services	7	6	5	5	3	
Educational counseling	4	7	7	6	1	1
Personal counseling	2	6	7	6	2	3
Housing location	8	5	5	4	1	3
Short-term loans	6	7	5	4		4
Day care		6	2	3		15
Other (responses not specified)	2	1		1		22
Job Placement	6	7	5	7		1

INDIAN GRADUATE FACULTY AT SCHOOLS OF SOCIAL WORK

Of the nineteen Indian graduate faculty who were identified and located, ten ultimately responded to the survey. Because of the small number of respondents, it is difficult to make meaningful comparisons of this group's responses and the responses of Indian students and graduates.

A Profile of Indian Graduate Faculty Members

Graduate faculty respondents represented six tribes--the Arapahoe, Laguna, Sioux (Rosebud and Yankton), Yaqui-Papago, and the Yurok (all with one faculty member each) and the Cherokee (with four faculty members)--and taught at eight schools of social work. Two Indians taught at the University of Oklahoma, and two taught at Arizona State University.

The ten respondents held the following ranks: professor (one), associate professor (one), assistant professor (four), clinical professor (two), and lecturer (two). All of the respondents with the exception of one faculty person had been appointed to their ranks between 1970 and 1975.

Minority groups have been very critical of the issue of faculty rank since traditionally rank is accompanied by much power and influence. Faculty who hold full or associate professorships wield much influence in the total governance of a school, at least in such areas as the appointment and promotion of faculty, curricular matters, recruitment, and admission standards. Until very recently schools of social work have been reluctant to recruit and hire minority persons, including Indians, and most Indian faculty are of low rank and have little influence in promoting change. The requirement that faculty hold doctorates in order to achieve rank has also meant that most Indian faculty hold low ranks. Many Indians (and non-Indians, for that matter) believe that doctorates do not automatically endow people with the expertise they need in order to provide students with a functional education. As was mentioned previously, the San Jose' State School of Social Work (California) has successfully used "Barrio Professors." Indian faculty in schools of social work are aware of the significance of those issues, and they support change. Hopefully, as more Indian faculty acquire doctoral degrees, they will be able to move into positions of greater influence. By the same token, it may be useful to use certain people in Indian communities as teachers in some schools of social work.

Together the ten faculty members held the full range of traditional faculty assignments, from administrator to classroom teacher. Five of the faculty respondents were directors of formal Indian programs at their schools, and four reported that they were teaching courses on minorities and/or the Indian. Two were engaged in advising Indian students, and nine were involved in the recruitment of Indian students. One graduate faculty person was teaching a specific course on child welfare, while three were teaching undergraduate as well as graduate courses. One faculty person reported being a member of a search committee for the deanship of his school (Arizona State University). All ten faculty persons were involved to some extent in programming for Indian students, even though two held positions at schools which did not have formal programs for Indians.

Faculty Perceptions of Social Work Education

Perceptions of Curricular Relevance. Table 10 shows the divergent responses of the ten faculty members on curricular relevance to Indian people. Although the ten faculty members expressed a general dissatisfaction with curricular relevance, it should be noted that the social welfare policy area was perceived as most adequately meeting the learning needs of Indian people. Human behavior curricula were also rated moderately well, while social work methods curricula and child welfare curricula received very low ratings. Six of the respondents explained that schools of social work were at various stages in incorporating content into their curricula on American Indians, but all efforts were seen as being essentially at beginning stages.

Although the questionnaire did not ask faculty members whether they felt that they were making an impact in changing curricula and field experiences to better reflect Indian reality, some opinions on this subject were given informally by the respondents and others. Most of the Indian faculty did feel that they were beginning to find more time to devote to changing curricula. However, they noted that the changes were still only beginning. There seemed to be a recognition that curriculum development is an ongoing process which involves experimentation and debate and that as Indian people redefine their needs and problems, curricula should also change. For example, since child welfare services for Indian people--especially in relation to foster care and adoption--are currently of great importance, both Indian and non-Indian social work students shoul have an opportunity to focus meaningfully on them.

TABLE 10

FACULTY VIEWS OF THE RELEVANCE
OF GRADUATE CURRICULA
(T=10)

	Meets Needs		Not Available	No Response
	Yes	No		
Social Welfare Policy and Planning	5	5		
Human Behavior	4	6		
Social Work Methods	2	7	1	
Child Welfare	2	7	1	
Other				10

Perceptions of Support Services. Faculty respondents were asked to evaluate the support services of the schools where they taught (see table 11). Only two of the ten respondents believed that the recruitment services at their schools were adequate, and only two believed that financial aid services at their schools met the needs of Indian students. In five other support service areas--remedial courses, tutorial services, short-term loans, child care, and job placement services--the majority of the faculty respondents believed that their schools were not meeting Indian students' needs. One faculty person from a school with a formal Indian program indicated that Indian students did not need job placement services since they received many job offers without even looking for a job. Another respondent emphasized that the gradual restriction of federal funding was so seriously hampering recruitment, financial assistance, and other services to Indian students that it was difficult to continue the present level of programming. Another person commented that tutorial services served the same function as remedial courses.

Unfortunately, the questionnaire did not ask respondents what roles they were playing in relation to these services and how they might help to improve them. However, informal communications indicated that Indian faculty tend to be held solely responsible for these services by their school administrations and faculty and by Indian students, and that this was felt to be extremely time and energy consuming. Faculty felt that they needed some assistance, either in the planning and provision of these services or in the committee work which exists in abundance in schools of social work.

Perceptions of Non-Indian Support for Indian Programs. Indian faculty members' perceptions of non-Indian faculty support for support services to Indian students are presented in table 12. For the most part, respondents felt that non-Indian faculty gave moderate levels of support to formal programs for Indians. However, their support for some services, such as day care and short-term loans, received less positive ratings than support for services such as personal counseling and job placement. Only two of the ten respondents specifically commented on the lack of awareness of Indian students and their school problems, and one person noted a lack of non-Indian faculty support for the formal Indian program at his school. This respondent indicated that he doubted that non-Indian faculty were even aware of the existence of this program.

Most faculty respondents felt that non-Indian faculty gave "some" or "high" support to curricular content on Indians.

TABLE 11

INDIAN FACULTY MEMBERS' PERCEPTIONS
OF THEIR SCHOOLS' SUPPORT SERVICES
(T=10)

	Needs Met		Not Available	No Response
	Yes	No		
Recruitment	2	8		
Financial Support	2	7		1
Support Services:				
Remedial courses		9		1
Tutorial services	4	6		
Educational counseling	6	3		1
Personal counseling	7	2		1
Housing location	5	4	1	
Short-term loans	3	4	1	2
Child care	2	6		1
Other				10
Job Placement	2	6		2

TABLE 12

INDIAN FACULTY MEMBERS' PERCEPTIONS OF NON-INDIAN FACULTY SUPPORT FOR SUPPORT SERVICES
(T=10)

	Support or Lack of Support					
	None	Little	Some	High	Full	No Response
Recruitment		2	5	3		
Financial Support		2	5	3		
Support Services:						
Remedial courses	2	3	4		1	
Tutorial services	1	4	2	2	1	
Educational counseling	1	3	3	3		
Personal counseling	1	2	4	3		
Housing location	2	4	4			
Short-term loans	2	5	2			1
Day care	4	3	2	1		
Other		1	1			8
Job Placement	2	1	6	1		

A few respondents were mildly critical of non-Indian faculty for not being sensitive to this need, and most others made only limited comments. Generally, however, faculty responses seemed to be more positive than those of the other two groups (see table 13). Nevertheless, the informal messages conveyed by most Indian faculty expressed concern about covert non-Indian faculty resistance to the incorporation of curricular content on Indians.

Faculty respondents generally perceived non-Indian student support for recruitment, financial assistance, and support services to be higher than non-Indian faculty support. Only one person indicated that non-Indian students did not support financial assistance, and two people responded that non-Indian students did not provide support for job location services for Indian students. Otherwise, the response pattern indicated that Indian faculty felt that non-Indian students supported recruitment, financial aid, and other support services for Indians to an accumulatively high degree (see table 14). However, some Indian faculty and students informally reported that the provision of resources to minority students was causing a "back lash" by nonminority students in some schools because the competition for stipends, scholarships, and other funds is greater. Resentment probably stems from nonminority students' perceptions that minority students are receiving the major portion of shrinking resources.

Because the ten faculty members represented only eight schools and six of these eight schools have formal programs for Indian students, the responses of this group may be skewed. On the other hand, these responses could be viewed as supporting the idea of formalized programs for Indians and demonstrating a belief that these programs have great positive results for Indian students, faculty members, and Indian communities.

TABLE 13

INDIAN FACULTY MEMBERS' PERCEPTIONS OF NON-INDIAN FACULTY SUPPORT FOR CURRICULAR CONTENT RELEVANT TO INDIANS
(T=10)

	Support or Lack of Support					
	None	Little	Some	High	Full	No Response
Social Welfare Policy and Planning		1	5	3	1	
Human Behavior		2	4	3	1	
Social Work Methods		2	4	2	1	1
Child Welfare Services		3	4	2	1	
Research		3	4	2	1	
Other					1	9
Field Work (special arrangements for Indian students)			4	4	2	
Field Work (special arrangements for non-Indian students interested in Indians)			4	5	1	

TABLE 14

FACULTY MEMBERS' PERCEPTIONS OF NON-INDIAN
STUDENT SUPPORT FOR SUPPORT SERVICES
(T=10)

	Support or Lack of Support					
	None	Little	Some	High	Full	No Response
Recruitment		4	3	3		
Financial Support	1	2	4	3		
Support Services:						
Remedial courses		3	4	2		
Tutorial services		3	3	4		
Educational counseling		3	3	4		
Personal counseling		3	3	3		1
Housing location		4	3	3		
Short-term loans		3	2	4		1
Day care		5	1	3		1
Other			NO RESPONSES			
Job Placement	2	1	2	4		1

ISSUES IN SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION

In spite of the low response rate to the survey, a reasonably clear picture of graduate-level (MSW) education in social work as it pertains to Indian people emerges from the data. While generalizations beyond these survey groups cannot reasonably be made, supplementary information gathered informally does tend to support these analyses of the survey data.

One major conclusion which can be drawn is that formal graduate educational programs in social work for Indians in off-reservation colleges appear to be the most effective way of serving Indian students and their communities. A second conclusion is that much more work needs to be done by schools of social work, including those schools with formalized programs for Indians, to improve all aspects of their programs so that they can better serve Indian people. Finally, there is a need for greater participation by Indian people in many aspects of these programs.

GENERAL SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVING SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION FOR INDIANS

While there does not seem to be any ideal programmatic model which can guide educators in the development of formal graduate social work programs for Indians, this survey did suggest several ways in which schools of social work--including those with formal programs for Indians--can improve their programs to service Indian people better and to better reflect the socioeconomic and cultural realities of reservation and off-reservation Indian communities:

1. Indian tribes and groups must be given the primary responsibility and opportunity to develop social work educational programs for Indian students. Such programs should have personnel, including directors, who are of Indian descent and who are recognized as such by their communities. Minimally directors of these programs should be appointed as associate deans to insure Indian access to deans and other administrators. Hopefully such action would minimize the number of organizational forces hindering the successful development and operation of such programs. Although it may be desirable for directors

of Indian programs to have doctorates, in accordance with the value structure of academia, from an Indian standpoint a doctorate is functionally not necessary to insure effective programs, and from a practical standpoint there are very few Indians with doctorates in social work at the present time.

2. Having Indian faculty present in schools of social work may also contribute to the success of MSW programs. Therefore, Indian social workers should seek faculty positions in schools of social work, at least in schools that are located relatively close to large Indian populations, since they can definitely exert some influence on students who are often attending schools which are far from their reservations. However, it is essential to recognize that systemic barriers to the recruitment, retention, and promotion of minority faculty, including Indians, do exist in schools of social work. While these barriers were identified clearly by a subcommittee of the CSWE's Commission on Minority Groups in 1972, many of them still seem to be in existence.[21] Thus, faculty recruitment efforts should be vigorously pursued.

Faculty training programs should also be developed. While social work organizations such as the Council on Social Work Education and some schools of social work periodically offer faculty development sessions, these sessions are infrequent and do not always meet the needs of Indian faculty. Such training programs can be successful. Black and Chicano social work groups feel that they have successfully carried out such training programs for their people and point to the increasing number of qualified black and Chicano faculty members at schools of social work.

3. Programs should also have strong ongoing ties to undergraduate and associate degree level programs that either have Indian students or have the potential to attract them and to on-reservation college programs. The formal social work programs for Indians at the University of Utah and Portland State have some ties to undergraduate programs, and these ties have proven very useful, both in recruiting Indian graduate candidates and in facilitating the exchange of ideas and the mutual support that results from such exchanges. At Utah Indian students enter the four-year program during their junior years and are recruited primarily from undergraduate programs located within the state of Utah. This program has been very successful in terms of the number of students who obtain MSWs, partially because students are provided with financial and other forms of support during their last two undergraduate years and also during the two-year MSW program. The various Indian higher educational programs located mostly on reservations can

provide another linkage which may be useful in improving social work education for Indians. Most of these programs allow students to select courses or programs in some human service area, including social welfare, and to later receive an associate's or even a baccalaureate degree without leaving their reservations. These linkages offer Indian people who take advantage of them the chance to implement truly "career-ladder" opportunities since an individual may choose to enter the work force at any degree point.

4. Almost all of the existing graduate Indian programs have been able to establish special practicum placements for both Indian and non-Indian students in social welfare agencies which serve Indian clientele. Since governmental agencies, especially federal agencies, can offer practicum placements, they should be continually developed, both qualitatively and quantitatively. Indian-controlled organizations, such as urban Indian centers and tribally run human service agencies, are another major resource. Finally, there are a few private social welfare agencies, usually located off reservations, such as Lutheran Social Services, that could be used for practicum placement purposes. These agencies have been responsible for certain Indian child welfare services, such as adoption, and therefore could develop into special Indian child welfare practicum placements.

Although most schools have been reluctant to apply the concept of "block placements," this type of placement could be very effective. Basically, "block placement" means that students devote varying blocks of time (a semester or two quarters) to a social agency on a full-time basis without scheduling any course work, except perhaps for some supplementary theoretical courses or tutorials. Thus, the block placement permits students to obtain experience on reservations or at other Indian locations at a considerable distance from the schools of social work which they attend. Both Portland State University and the University of Utah have placed Indian students in Alaska, and the placements have been deemed successful by the schools, the agencies, and the students involved.

There are two potential side benefits to developing social work practicum placements in agencies that serve Indian people. First, they provide a means of demonstrating to those agencies that trained Indian people are capable of functioning as professional social workers; and secondly, they represent one of many ways of developing job placements for Indian social work graduates. Some schools reported informally that many of their students have obtained job offers from the agencies in which they completed their practicum placements.

THE ISSUE OF CURRICULAR RELEVANCE

Until recently very little attention has been given to the issue of curricular relevance since Indian people involved in social work education have lost much time and energy in "political" conflicts within schools of social work over such issues as how recruitment and admission standards pertain to Indians and other minorities. However, with the gradual increase in Indian faculty, some attention is now being directed to curricula, and the Association of American Indian Social Workers recently recommended that social work curricula be adapted to make them more relevant to Indian cultures and lifestyles.[22] The association has also attempted to get its members to work on this issue, but it has been hampered by a lack of funds.

The new accreditation policy for the master's degree in social work devised by the Council on Social Work Education in 1970 offers schools of social work a set of flexible guidelines within which they can freely adapt curricula to meet students' learning needs. Thus, because of CSWE's accreditation role, schools are expected to relate curricula to the multicultural character of our society and to meet the learning needs of minorities and/or Indians in their geographic area and/or who are students. Presently problems revolve around implementation of this policy. Indian students, faculty, social workers, and Indian nonsocial workers can be helpful in implementing this policy by developing new social work curricula, as well as by finding field placements for Indian students who desire to complete their practicum assignments in social welfare programs which serve Indian people.

This curriculum-building task can be carried out if some group or agency will provide funds to do the job adequately, as other minority group efforts in this area have shown. For example, the Chicano Training Center in Houston has been able to develop some impressive curricular materials on the Chicano community with the help of a NIMH grant.[23]

In addition, non-Indian opposition to the inclusion of curricular material on minority concerns must be overcome. Recently, opinions within educational institutions have tended to polarize on the appropriateness of including content on minorities, and Indian students and faculty are aware that support or lack of support for such curricular modifications will affect the likelihood of change.

SUGGESTED CURRICULAR MODIFICATIONS

In order to relate curricular content to Indians, two tasks need to be accomplished. First, a decision must be made on what content should be included. Second, a decision must be made on how it should be packaged.

Developing Course Content Relevant to Indians

In spite of the problems which accompany attempts to change social work curricula, material on Indian socioeconomic conditions could be incorporated with little controversy. Although this content could include information on Indian health conditions, there might be some disagreement about incorporating subjects such as suicide, alcoholism, and mental health. For example, there is conflicting opinion on the rate of suicide among Indian people, with those who do not agree that Indians have a suicide rate above the national average arguing that statistics are distorted because of record-keeping and reporting errors and because suicide is defined incorrectly.[24] Similarly, some Indians and non-Indians believe that the loose use of the term "alcoholism" in relation to Indian drinking behavior (as opposed to the drinking behavior of other groups in the country) increases its reported incidence.[25] A third controversy concerns the causes of alcoholism among Indians. One expert has gone to the trouble to identify forty-two theories of the causes of Indian alcoholism. For purposes of simplification, he has categorized these theories into six major categories: cultural, social, economic, biological, psychological, and combinations of these five.[26]

These controversies illustrate the difficulty of incorporationg content on Indians into certain curricular areas. Probably the most acceptable selection method of dealing with these controversies, which is used by some schools, involves presenting the various sides of controversies along with the evidence that supports each position. Other schools take a position on an issue and provide support for that position (e.g., alcoholism is a very serious problem for Indian people since its incidence among Indians is far above the national average). Generally, however, schools reporting the inclusion of curricular content on the socioeconomic conditions and health status of Indians have managed to include this content without too much difficulty by adding it to the social welfare policy area, while some courses are added to the human behavior in the social environment area.

With regard to the historical and policy experiences of Indian people, courses have tended to focus rightfully on the unique status of Indian tribes in relation to the federal government, based on the treaties between tribes and the United States. Indian people contend that the federal government's breaking of treaties has contributed detrimentally to Indians' present health, educational, economic, and social status. Until recently there has been very little curricular content on the jurisdictional problems and disputes between Indians and government at all levels over such issues as the provision of social welfare services. However, more attention needs to be given to these areas since much of the past content on them has been descriptive in nature and subject to factual errors and omissions. A recent study by CSRD takes a new look at these issues and should set the stage for further research.[27]

Courses on and content related to racism have grown in popularity in the curricula of many schools of social work, including those that have formal Indian programs. Although the processes involved in racism may be basically the same for all minority groups, it should be remembered that Indian tribes have generally not seen themselves as a part of the minority movement of recent times. They have not wanted to integrate with the general population but instead have sought the right to self-determination and the right to continue their unique status as self-governing tribes.

The greatest curricular challenge arises over the inclusion of content on tribal cultures, and this area is fraught with significant problems and controversies. Since many people feel that culture cannot be taught, it has been argued that the best that can be done is to provide some content on the cultures of a select number of tribes in order to convince non-Indian students that tribal cultures are real and continue to exist in their basic forms. This area needs more attention from Indian people in terms of what material should be included in curricula or whether cultural material should be included at all, since even within a given tribe people may disagree about their own tribal culture. Some curricula have attempted to include cultural factors that are considered to be fairly universal among many tribes, such as generosity and the importance of the extended family (kinship). Other cultural universals which have been promoted by both Indian and non-Indian people as being reliable enough to add to social work curricula have most frequently been included in the human behavior sequence areas (growth and development) and to some extent in the social work methods area. For example, the University of Washington reported three culture-related courses in

its human behavior sequence. One course compared Erikson and Piaget's theories of child development with historical and traditional southwest Indian child-rearing practices, specifically Pueblo and Navajo practices. This course was taught by a southwestern Indian faculty person familiar with these tribes. A second course focused on Indians who live in two worlds, such as the reservation person who moves to an urban area, and also emphasized the skills which are necessary in order to work with such people. A third University of Washington course, now in the process of development, will center on minority child and family casework and will include Indians.

The material which now exists about techniques and methods of social work practice is largely fragmentary and limited, and little attention has been given to the area by Indian people, including social work professionals. However, since 1970 professional journals have carried some articles by Indian social workers about how to work effectively with Indian clientele. These articles are based on the authors' practice with Indian clientele and on their own growth and life experiences.[28] Current methods courses should offer these and similar articles for inclusion in graduate social work curricula with the clear understanding that this is the first step in the development of methods content which is relevant to Indians.

There is also a great deal of literature available on Indian child welfare and legal and jurisdictional issues in the delivery of child welfare services to reservation Indians which can be incorporated into the curricula of selected schools of social work.[29] For example, the University of Denver's School of Social Work has used much of this material in an introductory course on Indians since it has implications for social welfare policy, human behavior, and methods and techniques, as well as Indian child welfare. The same may be true of other material related to Indians.

The University of Utah has developed another effective method of focusing attention on Indian concerns. Between each of their four years of school students are offered supplemental field practicum and theoretical work in areas of interest to them. For example, one summer group work skills and introductory material on community organization were offered, and both were taught within Indian settings. Each summer Utah supplements its own Indian faculty with Indian faculty from other schools who have special expertise in the areas of focus.

Finally, Indian students should be given the opportunity and the support necessary to enable them to engage in research in their areas of interest, which have frequently been focused on Indian concerns. Some schools, such as Portland State, have reported success in organizing and relating their research to Indians.

The Packaging of Curricula

The second major question in curriculum development is how to package content on Indians since there has been controversy within schools of social work in recent years about whether content on minorities is a legitimate part of social work curricula. Those schools of social work which reported content on Indians have some content in curriculum sequences on Indians and also offer a few specialized courses on Indians. Ideally, however, content on Indians should be incorporated into all curricular areas, with special courses focusing on areas of current concern to Indian communities, such as child welfare. If schools remain flexible, special courses can be dropped and added to reflect the changing conditions and concerns of Indian people. Such changes would be similar to those being made by many schools which have been pressured by various interest groups to modify their curricula.

Also related to the structuring of curricula is the issue of developing continuing education programs in schools of social work. So far, although very little has been done in this area, much needs to be done. Courses designed to update knowledge and skills could be offered to Indian social workers and to non-Indians who work with Indian clientele through such programs. For example, continuing education courses offered on reservations could tap the current interest and concern with the delivery of child welfare services to Indians.

Both professional and nonprofessional Indian people should participate in and support curriculum development efforts outside schools of social work as well as within them. Indian organizations, such as the Association of American Indian Social Workers, are already engaged in gathering curricular materials, and Indian social workers now working in the field could provide raw data from which other curricular materials could be developed.

Finally, it is neither feasible nor realistic to expect more than a few schools of social work to develop and operate formal programs for Indian students. However, it is important that the special programs that do exist continue and that

additional schools develop programs if Indian people feel that they are needed, especially if there are large Indian populations in their geographical areas.

SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION IN NONGRADUATE INSTITUTIONS

Although undergraduate social work education was not included in this study, it is nevertheless important to Indian people, since there are many schools across the country (some of which are near Indian reservations) which offer undergraduate social work or social welfare programs. In addition, as the 1974 CSWE survey indicated, there were many Indian students in some of these programs. It is important to know more about these programs since the CSWE and the NASW both consider the bachelor's degree in an approved undergraduate social welfare or social work program as an entry level degree into the profession. Considerable attention and support have also been given to associate's programs because there are many positions for people with the associate's degree in social welfare programs which serve Indians, and many community and junior colleges have programs which educate people in the human services.

These two levels of formal education are also significant because the number of reservation-based community colleges and other learning centers which have been providing courses of study in the human services have grown. Some of these facilities offer their students the opportunity to complete their B.A. degrees without leaving the reservation through various kinds of arrangements with non-Indian institutions which give credit and degrees to Indian students attending these reservation-based institutions. For example, the Sintė Gleshkå Community College on the Rosebud Sioux Reservation in South Dakota has an arrangement with the Black Hills State College to grant degrees for work done by its students in several fields. Indian-controlled and -supported educational institutions on reservations also offer the opportunity to explore ways that formal social work education at all levels may provide the relevance which is usually missing from educational programs located off reservations. For example, it is possible that these reservation-based institutions could provide some courses and that they could supervise practicum placements for one or more schools of social work having formal Indian programs. Such arrangements would offer Indian students the chance to complete some of their graduate social work education on reservations.

A parallel survey of the undergraduate and associate levels of formal social work education would also be useful since social welfare programs serving Indian people require personnel with all levels of educational preparation, and many Indian people feel that it is not necessary for all human service workers to have a master's degree.

However, the key positions in social welfare organizations generally require at least a master's degree, and it is unlikely that this requirement will change in the foreseeable future. People with expertise or potential in areas of administration, planning, supervision, consultation and research are also needed in programs serving Indians, while the expressed federal policy of Indian self-determination makes it imperative that these positions be filled by the tribes involved in social welfare programs serving their people. In order to promote meaningful self-determination it is necessary to continue the recruitment and education of Indian people at the graduate level, while others are encouraged to earn the associate's or bachelor's degree.

IMPLICATIONS AND POLICY ALTERNATIVES

IMPLICATIONS OF THE SURVEY FINDINGS

This survey demonstrates that increasing numbers of American Indians are entering the field of social work and that they are becoming involved in all of the components of the social welfare delivery system which affect Indian people, including social work education. Almost all of the Indian respondents to this survey have been or are involved to some extent in formal education and/or programs in social welfare and mental health. It appears that Indian graduates with MSW degrees are in high demand in all components of the social welfare system. However, recent cutbacks in federal funds, which have been the major supporter of educational programs in social work which benefit Indians, may create a reduction in the number of Indians seeking the MSW degree.

A major finding of this survey is that schools of social work with formal programs for Indians have recruited most of the Indian students now in social work education. In spite of respondents' criticisms, these schools are also giving more attention to components of their programs other than recruitment, such as incorporating content on Indians into their curricula and providing support services to help Indian students stay in school. Indian faculty respondents reported that some progress is being made in these programs, even though they do not view them as the integrated, smoothly operating programs that they and Indian students judge acceptable. These schools offer some courses specifically on Indians, and they have some curricular content or units on Indians incorporated into basic course sequences, such as social welfare policy and services. For example, the University of Denver reported that it requires all students to take two courses on minorities and racism. The first course focuses on racism, its processes, and how it affects all minorities (including Indians), while the second allows students to choose among specialized study areas on minority groups, including one area which focuses on Indians.

This survey also demonstrated that the schools of social work which responded were not focusing on Indian child welfare. Curricular content in this area was infrequent and spotty, and no specialized practicum placements in this area were reported, in spite of the fact that curricula focused on children and families. It seems that unless

a student deliberately tailors his individual educational program to emphasize child welfare he has to specialize in the treatment of children and family problems.

Almost all respondents saw a need for more research, publication, and dissemination of information on Indians so that curricular materials for use in both education and training could be developed. Respondents also felt that nonprofessional Indian people should have input into this curriculum development process and that they should plan and evaluate social work educational programs. Finally, most of the respondents to the survey concluded that greater attention needs to be given to Indian cultural reality when social work educational programs are planned and that these programs should be made relevant to Indians students. Respondents believed that having Indian faculty at schools of social work was helpful in this respect, even though this meant taking qualified Indians away from direct service jobs where they are also badly needed.

POLICY ALTERNATIVES

Since the federal government provides the money which supports stipends and scholarships for Indian people and the development of recruitment and educational programs for Indian social work students, it is imperative that we examine the policies that might be promoted by those in positions of influence.

There are basically two policy alternatives that can be supported and pursued. First, there is the present policy, which encourages schools of social work to seek funds from the National Institute of Mental Health and other federal sources for the establishment of a demonstration-type recruitment and educational program for Indians in the field of social work. This policy called for the eventual termination of federal funding, with colleges and universities taking over and continuing the programs using their own funds as well as any other funds that they could obtain. Under this policy stipend and scholarship money for individual Indian students were to be obtained from various sources, but most funds were to be federal, although the schools of social work were to administer them. Advisory boards of Indian people were also to be formed by the schools of social work which were funded. In recent years, it was decided that funding for these programs would be reduced and stopped as soon as was practical. In essence, the present administration places low priority on human service programs, including programs for Indian people.

The second alternative, which is actually a refinement of present policy, would emphasize greater Indian input into and control over the funds devoted to social work education. It would require that the present number of schools with formal programs for Indians be maintained and that more be financed if possible. In order to receive federal funds, colleges and universities with these programs would have to devise concrete plans for the gradual replacement of federal money over a set number of years. In addition, present advisory boards would be replaced with policy-making boards composed of Indians so that Indians could have greater input into and control over these programs. Stipend and scholarship money would be channeled through Indian tribes and groups so that they could exert greater control over who received money and which schools benefited from it. At present, much funding is controlled by schools of social work themselves, and Indians have argued that the schools have given a few stipends to non-Indians who claimed to be Indians. Incentives for Indian-controlled research and curriculum development could also be built into funding arrangements. With greater input and control by Indian people, shifts in emphasis of Indian programs could be made. As special problem areas like child welfare (adoptions and foster care) arise, schools could adapt their programs to make these issues meaningful to Indian students and others who might be interested in them.

Finally, schools with formal programs could be required to develop and make field placements available to all interested Indian students. Field placements offer the opportunity for the students to work with Indian clientele and the "block-placement" concept could also be implemented. Presently it is very difficult for Indian students to obtain field placements in Indian settings if their schools are not located near reservations or Indian communities, but some schools which have attempted to implement placements on a selective basis (Utah, Portland State, Oklahoma, and Barry College) have been successful. This policy could tie into both the reservation-based community colleges and selected undergraduate social welfare and human service programs.

In conclusion, it should be reemphasized that it is essential that there be greater Indian input into and control of social work educational programs for Indians. Current federal policy supports this concept since numerous treaties recognize Indian tribes as autonomous governmental entities, and the tribes wish to have greater input into the field.

In addition, cutbacks in funding for Indian programs must be resisted. Although most of the financial support for these programs will continue to come from the federal government, it is imperative that continuing efforts be made by the administrations of schools of social work, including the directors of these programs, and by Indian communities to seek other funding sources.

NOTES

1. Charles E. Farris, "The American Indian: Social Work Education's Neglected Minority," Journal of Education for Social Work 2, no. 2 (Spring 1975): 37-43.

2. Arnulf M. Pins, "Entering the Seventies: Changing Priorities for Social Work Education," Social Work Education Reporter 18, no. 1 (March 1970): 32R.

3. Hazel W. Hertzberg, The Search for an American Indian Identity (Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1971), pp. 62-63.

4. Ibid.

5. Ibid., p. 138.

6. Ibid., pp. 138-139.

7. Larrie D. Wanberg, "Historical Perspective of the Indian Dilemma: The Character of Native American Culture in Modern Conflict" (DSW dissertation, University of Denver, 1973), pp. 3, 15, 4.

8. Leo and Alice Cadotte, Standing Rock Indian Reservation, Fort Yates, North Dakota, September 1973.

9. Jimm G. Goodtracks, "Native American Non-Interference," Social Work (November 1973): 30.

10. Harold E. Fey and D'Arcy McNickle, Indians and Other Americans (New York: Perennial Library, Harper and Row, 1970), pp. 95-103.

11. Vine Deloria, Jr., Of Utmost Good Faith (San Francisco: Straight Arrow Books, 1971), p. 20.

12. Goodtracks, p. 30.

13. Farris, p. 38; and Goodtracks, p. 30.

14. Wanberg, pp. 1-2; and Ronald G. Lewis and Man Keung Ho, "Social Work with Native Americans," Social Work (September 1975): 379-382.

15. Pins, p. 32R.

16. National Association of Social Workers, A Program Action Guide (New York: Author, 1971), p. 15.

17. John E. Mackey, American Indian Task Force Report (New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1973), pp. 1-3.

18. Lillian Ripple, ed., Statistics on Social Work Education in the United States: 1974 (New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1975), pp. 6, 12, 20-23, 48-50.

19. Bernardo Eureste, Alma Mitchell, John A. Soto, and August Swain, "Pilot Project: Education for Minority Groups," The Texas Consortium of Graduate Schools of Social Work, Typescript of presentation at the 1976 Annual Program Meeting of the Council on Social Work Education, Philadelphia, Feb. 29-Mar. 3, 1976.

20. Ripple, p. 26.

21. Robert W. Roberts, "Systemic Barriers to Recruitment, Retention, and Promotion of Ethnic Minority Faculty in Schools of Social Work," Social Work Education Reporter 20, no. 3 (September-October 1972), pp. 25-27.

22. Mackey, pp. 1-3.

23. Frederico Souffle, Jr., ed., Curriculum Schema, Vol. I (Houston: Chicano Training Center, April 1974), pp. 1-15.

24. See, for example, Jack Bynum, "Suicide and the American Indian: An Analysis of Recent Trends," Native Americans Today: Sociological Perspectives, ed., Howard M. Bahr, Bruce A. Chadwick, and Robert C. Day (New York: Harper and Row, 1972), pp. 367-376, which argues that suicide among Indians is above the national average and defines suicide narrowly. For the position that it is difficult to generalize about Indian suicide rates, see Philip A. May and Larry H. Dizmang, "Suicide and the American Indian," Psychiatric Annals (November 1974): 22-28.

25. For two different perspectives on the subject of alcoholism and the American Indian, see Edward P. Dozier, "Problem Drinking Among American Indians," Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol (March 1966): 72-87; and Murray L. Wax, Indian Americans: Unity and Diversity (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1971), pp. 151-156.

26. Fenton E. Moss, "Outline of Causation of Indian Alcoholism," mimeographed (n.p.: n.d.).

27. See Center for Social Research and Development, Legal and Jurisdictional Problems in the Delivery of SRS Child Welfare Services on Indian Reservations (Denver: Center for Social Research and Development, Denver Research Institute, University of Denver, October 1975).

28. Carolyn L. Attneave, "Medicine Men and Psychiatrists in the Indian Health Service," Psychiatric Annals (November 1974): 6-8; Evelyn L. Blanchard, "Social Work With American Indians," The Social Welfare Forum (1972): 276-280; Goodtracks, pp. 30-34; Herbert H. Locklear, "American Indian Myths," Social Work (May 1972): 72-80; Lewis and Keung Ho, pp. 379-382; and Kathryn Polacca, "Ways of Working with Navajos Who Have Not Learned White Man's Ways," Navajo Times, 8 September 1966.

29. Legal and Jurisdictional Problems; and Ellen L. Slaughter, Indian Child Welfare: A Review of the Literature (Denver: Center for Social Research and Development, Denver Research Institute, University of Denver, January 1976).